DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 451 SP 020 832

AUTHOR Rohrkemper, Mary M.
TITLE Classroom Perspectives: A Comparison of Teachers', Students', and Observers' Perceptions of Teacher Behavior.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Modification; Behavior Problems; Classroom Techniques; Elementary Education; Interaction; Sex Differences; Socialization; *Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response; *Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Eight elementary school teachers, judged outstanding in ability to deal with difficult students but differing in socialization style (behavior modification, which involves rewards, or induction approaches, which emphasize rationales for behavior change), were the subjects of a study on classroom management strategies. The teachers nominated one male and one female pupil who best represented the following behavior patterns: (1) underachieving and defiant or hostile/aggressive; (2) hyperactive and distractible or shy; and (3) low achieving. Teachers also nominated three male and three female students who were not difficult. Teachers, students, and classroom observers were interviewed about their predictions and understanding of teacher responses to three vignettes depicting inappropriate student behavior: underachievement, hyperactivity, and low achievement. Responses were analyzed for general trends across sources of prediction, and comparisons were made among students whose teachers differed in socialization style and among students who differed in grade level, classroom adjustment, and sex. The data provide information on the difference between intended and actualized behavior and goals and indicate the need to examine the difference between messages which teachers intend to communicate to their students and that which is actually perceived. Differences among students' responses associated with grade level illustrate communication skills that teachers of younger children may want to improve so that students perceive teacher behavior as it was intended. Differences in students' reports that were associated with teacher socialization style underscore the need to learn more about the socialization role of the classroom teacher. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220451

CLASSROOM PERSPECTIVES: A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS', STUDENTS', AND OBSERVERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary M. Rohrkemper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Mary M. Rohrkemper[1]
University of Maryland

[1]This paper was originally presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association held in New York City, 1982. The author would like to acknowledge and thank Jo Cornell and Therese Keller who assisted with data collection; June Smith and Martha Walsh who transcribed the interview tapes; Jane Smith and Rae Ramsdell who assisted in coding the data; June Smith and Debbie Salters who helped prepare the data for analyses, Neelam Kher and Suwatana Soopokakit who conducted the data analyses; Ellen Mielke who assisted in manuscript preparation; and Jere Brophy for his helpful advice throughout the research effort.

This work was completed while the author was an intern at the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Program for Teaching and Instruction of the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-76-0073)

Requests for reprints or additional information should be sent to: Mary M. Rohrkemper, Department of Human Development, 3304A Benjamin Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

SP 020 832

ABSTRACT

Classroom Perspectives: A Comparison of Teachers', Students', and Observers' Perceptions of Teacher Behavior

Mary M. Rohrkemper, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

Eight elementary school teachers, judged outstanding in ability to deal with difficult students but differing in socialization style (behavior modification vs. induction) each nominated 18 students into various categories of classroom adjustment. Teachers, students, and classroom observers were interviewed about their predictions and understanding of teacher responses to three vignettes depicting inappropriate student behavior: underachievement, hyperactivity, and low achievement. Responses were analyzed for general trends across sources of prediction, and comparisons were made between students whose teachers differed in socialization style, and who differed in grade level, classroom adjustment, and sex.

RATIONALE

The notion of "perspective" has taken hold in much classroom research. Investigators, realizing the limitations of observational data when attempting to understand the psychological meaning of events for participants, have turned to interview methods with teachers and students. The present investigation shares this concern for the "multiple realities" in the classroom, as it examines teachers' classroom management strategies. Toward this end, interviews with teachers and their students were conducted. To highlight possible variation in students' classroom perceptions, data were examined for relationships with the type of teacher-student interaction portrayed [representing the three levels of problem ownership (Gordon, 1970, 1974)]; the student level of classroom adjustment (ranging from troublesome students to those who were easy and pleasurable to teach); sex; and developmental level, (students apt to be primarily preoperational, grades 1 and 2), and those apt to be primarily concrete operational, grades 3-5); and the socialization style of their teacher (behavior modification programs involving rewards vs. induction approaches emphasizing extended rationales for behavior change). (See Rohrkemper, Note 1.) An attempt was also made to "tie down" these self-reported perceptions and to examine the nature of any discrepancies in reports through comparison of teachers' and students' predictions, obtained through interview, with reports based on classroom observation alone. The Classroom Perspectives Study is not an experiment, it is a systematic gathering of self report data from teachers, their students, and classroom observers.

METHOD

Subjects. The subjects included eight teachers who had previously participated in the Classroom Strategy Study (CSS) (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981;

Rohrkemper & Brophy, Note 2) and had been extensively interviewed about their strategies for coping with difficult students. On the basis of these interviews, their principals' nominations, and observer ratings, teachers selected for participation in the present study were judged outstanding in their ability to deal with difficult students. Teachers' interviews in the CSS were also coded to allow their categorization into one of two socialization styles: a heavy emphasis on behavior modification or a heavy emphasis on induction. Teachers finally selected were those judged outstanding who differed in socialization style, and who spanned the elementary grades (1-5).

A further consideration involved the socioeconomic status level associated with the students in participating classrooms. Selected teachers taught in schools which were in one of two SES groups, based on the percentage of families in the school receiving Aid to Dependent Children. The distribution was balanced across the two types of teacher socialization style so that half of the classrooms in each level were from schools with 17-19 percent ADC families and the remaining classrooms were from schools with 39-47 percent. Once selected, teachers were interviewed to obtain their responses to the three vignettes, to verify their socialization style status and to nominate students in their classroom for participation in the study.

Teachers nominated one male and one female who best represented the following behavior patterns: students who challenge the teacher's authority: underachieving students and those who are defiant or hostile aggressive; students who have difficulty adjusting to the student role: hyperactive students and those who are distractible or shy; and students with self devaluation problems: low achieving students and those who exhibit failure syndrome or who are rejected by their peers. Teachers also nominated three males and three females who were not difficult,

but were instead easy and pleasurable to teach. In all, teachers nominated 18 students in their classrooms, balanced by sex as much as was possible. All nominated students whose parents agreed were interviewed. This involved 144 students, 72 males and 72 females (with some unevenness in individual classrooms). The substitution rate was 11% and due to initial denial of parental permission rather than student withdrawal once the interview had begun.

The third source of prediction of teacher behavior, the observer report, was supplied by staff members, unaware of the teachers' interview data and the purpose of the study. The observers, both undergraduate females (who later assisted with the student interviews), each observed in four classrooms for two half-days, and then wrote in script form their predictions and interpretations of teacher behavior.

Instruments and procedures. The data to be presented, then, concern the nature and extent of the agreement among teachers', students', and observers' predictions of teacher response to inappropriate student behavior, and the understandings of the motives, goals, and attitudes which are believed to underlie those teacher responses. These reports are based on predicted teacher responses to three written vignettes, each portraying inappropriate student behavior. They include underachievement, hyperactivity, and low achievement. The vignettes describe routine classroom events and are written to deliberately exclude extraneous detail to allow teachers and students across grade levels (1-5) to readily imagine depicted events as occurring in their classrooms. The students portrayed in the vignettes were all described as male to the teachers and observers, but were matched to the sex of the student when presented to students. No details were included that would type them by social class or other status variables.

The interview procedures differed in four respects. First, the teachers and observers themselves read the vignettes, but the vignettes were read to the students. Second, the student version was rewritten to simplify language and to represent a classmate point of view. For example, teachers and observers read the following vignette representing underachievement:

> Carl can do good work, but he seldom does. He will try to get out of work. When you speak to him about this, he makes a show of looking serious and pledging reform, but his behavior doesn't change. Just now, you see a typical scene: Carl is making paper airplanes when he is supposed to be working.

Students were read the following (with sex of fictional student matched to the sex of the respondent):

> Carl could do good work in school, but he fools around a lot. Carl hardly ever does his assignments, even when he tells Mrs. (Teacher) that he will. Today during work time everyone is busy, except Carl. He is making paper airplanes and Mrs. (Teacher) just noticed this.

A third procedural difference was that students were immediately asked to describe the event portrayed in the story to insure that memory difficulties or initial misperception of story content were not confounded with student prediction and interpretation of teacher behavior. Following these memory checks, students, like teachers and observers, were asked to report what their teachers would say and do if the described event were to occur in their classroom. Additional questions concerning teacher intent, expectation, and perception followed.

Finally, teachers' and students' predictions were tape recorded and compared with observers' predictions which were written, as if scripts for a play. For example, in response to the vignette portraying Carl, the underachiever described previously, an observer predicted the following script:

"Carl, put away the airplanes and get back to work." If there were many people doing this, I would turn out the lights - this is their signal for stopping. If Carl persisted, I would say "Carl, I'm getting angry that you are still fooling around. I'll have to take out some marbles." We have a large jar, when the class is good or someone does something exceptional, I put marbles into it. If someone is misbehaving, I take marbles out. When the jar gets full of marbles, the class gets a party. This works well because besides self-reward - a party - there's peer pressure on a student to behave - everyone wants a party. I would also say, "Carl, if your work isn't done you'll have to stay in from recess to finish it."

Coding Procedures. All teacher and student responses to the vignettes were tape recorded and typed into transcripts. These typescripts, along with the observers' written scripts, were coded for predicted teacher behavior (including types of rewards, punishments, supportive behavior, threatening behavior, general problem solving style and strategies, including gathering of information, student involvement, and extent of teacher language), and the cognition believed to underlie that teacher behavior (including perceived intention, goal and attitude) with each fictional student. Coders were trained by the author and did not participate in data collection. Coders, except for the author, were blind to the specific hypotheses of the study.

The sources of predictions of teacher behavior were coded by a member of the CSS staff who had had experience with that type of coding (if not the exact codes) for three years. A percent exact agreement analysis between the coder and the author was completed on a subset of data. [Percent exact agreement = (total number of agreements) divided by (itself, plus number of disagreements, plus the number of codes made only by one coder).] The method of assessing agreement was a conservative one, so that if coders disagreed on whether a reward was symbolic or teacher-based, it was entered as a disagreement even though both

coders agreed it was a reward. The overall percent exact agreement was 86.5%, ranging from 82.5% on vignette one data, 88.5% on vignette two, and 88.3% on vignette three.

Remaining data, concerning student understanding of teacher behavior, obtained from direct questions in the student interview, were coded twice. Percent exact agreement before resolution was computed based on the codes of the first, middle, and last subject in each class for each vignette. The overall percent exact agreement prior to resolution was 84%.

Analyses. Each category within each variable (with the exception of two scale variables) was treated as an 0 (not used) or 1 (used) possibility and aggregated according to the specific analyses undertaken for each vignette. Averaging the codes in each level of aggregation yielded mean proportion scores indicating the likelihood that that subset of subjects would use each category in responding to that particular question for that vignette.

Frequency and breakdown data indicated data reduction was especially important given the number of 0 (not present) codes evident in all three sources of prediction. Thus, the types of predicted rewards, punishments, supportive behaviors, and threatening or pressuring behaviors were summed to form a single score for each variable. These sum scores reflect the number of different types, not absolute frequencies, within each of these four major clusters of behavior that were reported. The coding of teachers' predicted problem solving strategies with the fictional students also appeared to be too molecular. Accordingly, the different types of teacher strategies for nonacademic problem behavior were subgrouped by similarity where possible, as were the levels of student insight and the types of teacher rationale (see Table 1).

The remaining dichotomous and scale variables, along with the newly constructed sum and proportion variables were examined for the extent of agreement and the nature of the disagreement among the sources of prediction. In addition, student data were subjected to a multivariate repeated measures analysis separately for each vignette. These analyses allow discussion of differences in students' reports that are associated with teacher socialization style, and student grade level, sex, and level of classroom adjustment.

RESULTS

Comparison of the sources of prediction

General trends. General trends in the data were more profitably examined in terms of the perceived scope of teacher behavior rather than in the specifics of that behavior. Observers' and students' predictions were similar in that they seemed to focus only on immediate aspects of teacher behavior. In contrast, teachers typically discussed their strategies with the fictional students as occurring within a treatment package that involved differing teacher behavior and goals that evolved over time. These distinctions were especially evident in the predictions associated with the underachieving and hyperactive students. For example, teachers, observers, and students all reported teacher punishments and threatening behavior with these students. In addition, however, teachers' reports also included rewards and supportive behavior. Further, teacher self reports described more elaborated strategies, particularly with the underachiever who was viewed by teachers as an academic as well as a social problem -- a teacher perception missed by both observers and students.

In general, teachers' self-reports indicated more variation in teacher behavior across the three vignettes than either the observer or student reports. Thus, teachers were more apt to tailor their behavior to the specific problem

under consideration than to report strategies common to all types of student behavior. Thus, teachers' reported treatment of the hyperactive student differed from their approach with the underachiever in that these reports consisted primarily of nonacademic strategies, rather than both academic and nonacademic concerns. Both approaches are contrasted with the reported strategies with the low achiever, with whom the teachers concentrated on academic goals, a point largely argreed upon by both observers and students.

Overall, teachers' and observers' reports were most similar in their descriptions of teacher language and provision of rationales to students for expected behavior change. Teachers and students were more similar in their discussion of teacher punishment and threatening behaviors. Students and observers, as already mentioned, had the most agreement in their perception of the immediacy of teacher behavior and goals. Students were unique in their failure to mention any teacher rewards with any student. This includes students in behavior modification classrooms who were continually exposed to behavior-reward contingencies.

Student Reports: A Closer Look

In addition to these more general comparisons among the three sources of prediction of teacher behavior, students' responses were further subjected to a multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance. This was undertaken to allow a closer examination of just what it is that students expect their teacher to do in the classroom and why they think she acts this way. Students' responses were examined for general trends and for differences associated with teacher socialization style and student grade level, sex and level of classroom adjustment. All differences discussed were significant at or below the .05 level.

General trends. In general, students predicted similar punitive teacher responses to the underachieving and hyperactive students, but predicted different (more helpful or sympathetic, without mention of rewards) teacher behavior with the low achiever. Student understanding of teacher motivations underlying these responses were consistent across vignettes and indicated that students typically understood teacher behavior to stem from role constraints (both teacher and student) rather than from personality factors. Thus, students discussed teacher behavior as due to the demands of teaching ("that's her job") rather than due to teacher disposition ("she gets mad"), or due to student failure to meet the expectations of the student role ("because he's supposed to be working") rather than due to the student per se ("because he's not a nice boy"). The primary goal of these teacher responses differed across vignettes, however, as did the perceived content of teacher thoughts about each fictional student. These differences in student reports reflected the patterns of teacher attribution and behavior that have been found associated with the levels of problem ownership in teacher reports (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981, Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1982). Thus, in general, students appear to be aware of how a range of their classroom behavior in turn affects their teacher's cognition and behavior.

Grade level. Grade level considerations were the most useful in organizing the data. In terms of teacher behavior, younger students consistently reported more actual or threatened teacher punishment, including use of removal and isolation techniques, in all three vignette predictions, while older students reported more verbal controls, including provision of rationales and restatement of rules, in their predictions of teacher behavior. Older students were also more attuned to the subleties of teacher nonverbal behavior (i.e. tone, body stance, facial expression). It appears then, that younger students focus much

more on the more salient and discrete qualities of their teacher's behavior and that older students' readings of their teacher are more elaborate and fine tuned.

Differences in student understanding of teacher behavior associated with grade level parallel this pattern. Older students' understanding of the motivation underlying teacher behavior revealed a generally higher level of differentiation and sophistication in psychological and motivational constructs and goals as compared with the discussions of younger students. Younger students' constructs were also motivational, but were more global and value laden, and less differentiated across the vignettes. For example, when asked what their teacher thinks about each fictional student, younger children spoke more of teacher global evaluations of the student per se ("she thinks he's a bad boy" or "she thinks he's nice") while older students evoked more behavior specific evaluations, including teacher evaluations of student performance, ability, conformity to rules and affect ("she thinks he needs to try harder" or "she thinks he doesn't care enough"). These differences in prediction and understanding of teacher behavior associated with grade level are compatible with developmental expectations, and reflect as well older students' greater experience with the student role.

Teacher socialization style. Teacher socialization style was the second most useful organizer of the data and often involved interactions with grade level. Recall that teachers were selected for their greater relative emphasis on behavior modification programs or inductive approaches involving teacher provision of rationales for behavioral demands and a focus on psychological causality. These socialization styles were expected to differentially influence student predictions of teacher behavior and their understanding of that teacher behavior.

That is, students in behavior modification classrooms were expected to show more internal agreement in their predictions of teacher behavior than students in inductive classrooms, who were expected to evidence more sophistication in their interpretation of that behavior.

In general, student predictions of teacher behavior associated with teacher socialization style indicated that students in behavior modification classrooms, particularly at the early grade levels, consistently predicted more teacher punishment and control goals (as opposed to the simple management goals that were expected) than the students in the inductive classrooms. In contrast, students in inductive classrooms included more teacher language and rationale in their predictions, consistent with expectations.

Student understanding of predicted teacher behavior also revealed interesting associations with teacher socialization style and again interactions with grade level. Students in inductive classrooms were more likely to perceive their teacher as acting within her role, and to view positive concern for individual students as part of this role. Students in behavior modification classrooms were less likely to perceive instructional goals in their teacher's behavior and instead focused more on managerial concerns (i.e., concern for a smooth running classroom) as opposed to teacher behavior evolving from expectations and concerns for individual students. An interaction between grade level and teacher socialization style revealed that younger students in behavior modification classrooms were the least sophisticated of all students in both the focus and the nature of student evaluation ascribed to the teacher. These students' perceptions of their teacher's cognition were noted for their global character and negative tone ("she don't like bad kids"). These perceptions of

negative teacher cognition are likely an important factor in these students' predictions of the most punishment and control strategies in their teachers' responses to the students portrayed in the vignettes. Apparently these predictions of teacher behavior are influenced by the negative attitudes ascribed to the teacher, so that neutral or even positive behaviors that may occur are either not attended to or are not interpreted as such.

Teacher socialization style then appears to be associated with student prediction and understanding of teacher behavior in ways that have important implications for student understanding of classroom events. This is especially true in the early grades. Apparently younger students, who typically have less differentiated social cognition, do not learn these interpersonal interpretive skills through behavior modification procedures. Rather, they appear to benefit more from inductive socialization styles.

Student level of classroom adjustment. Student level of classroom adjustment was not as useful in organizing the data. Recall that students who participated had been nominated by their teacher as representing a range of classroom behavior. It had been hypothesized that students who, because of their own behavior patterns, experienced the classroom differently, would in turn predict and interpret teacher behavior differently. For example, it was expected that students who experienced teacher punishment more would predict more teacher punishment and negative attitudes in their reports. Similarly, students identified as easy and pleasurable to teach were expected to attribute positive expectations to their teacher and, in general, to exhibit a greater sophistication in their reports of both teacher behavior and teacher cognition than their "problem" nominee peers.

The data that emerged were difficult to interpret in that there were few main effects and most significant results involved puzzling and inconsistent interactions. Surprisingly, students who had been nominated as "non-problem" students who were easy and pleasurable to teach did not differ from their "problem student" peers in their prediction or their understanding of teacher behavior. Two clear patterns which did emerge, however, were associated primarily with the hyperactive vignette and concerned the underachieving and hyperactive nominees. In their predictions of teacher behavior with the fictional hyperactive student, underachieving nominees exhibited the most sophistication of the students in their portrayal of their teacher as verbal, reasoned in her approach, and as ultimately concerned with influencing the student to act appropriately in the classroom. It seems likely then, that the underachieving students understand their own interactions with their teacher, although given their nominee status, this understanding does not seem to be associated with behavioral change.

Hyperactive nominees were noteworthy in their understanding of teacher response to the fictional hyperactive student in that they were the most likely of all the students to attribute teacher behavior to managerial concerns and to negative teacher affect toward, and negative evaluations of, this student. This was especially true in the younger grades.

Sex Differences. Finally, student responses were examined for sex differences. Recall that students were nominated to allow equal representation of males and females in each behavior type under study. Sex differences were not useful in understanding the students' predictions of their teacher's responses,

but they were associated with a few issues in the interpretation of those teacher responses. Reports of teacher affect meshed with commonly held gender beliefs. That is, females were more apt to perceive their teacher as positive and nurturant than were males. Unexpectedly, however, females did not evidence greater sophistication in social perception than males. In fact, males in inductive classrooms were the most likely to differentiate teacher evaluation as tied to student behavior rather than global evaluation of the student *per se*.

DISCUSSION

In general it appears that teachers typically discuss their strategies with students as occurring within a treatment package that involves differing teacher behavior and goals over time. This programmatic teacher behavior was understandably missed by observers whose classroom observations were brief (2 half-days). What is not as readily dismissed, however, is the students' lack of knowledge of these general programs. Apparently students in general do not imbed a specific teacher behavior with a particular student within a larger complex of behavior. The student predictions of teacher behavior suggest that, while teachers may interact individually with students within a framework that for *them* provides meaning and direction to that specific action, students are unaware of this long term purposefulness. Students' perception of teacher behavior, which is believed to stem primarily from role constraints (both teacher and student), is nonetheless understood in terms of immediacy. Variations in these student responses that are associated with student grade level, teacher socialization style, student level of adjustment and sex differences do not alter this basic conclusion. If students are unaware of the "larger picture" of teacher behavior, the question that arises is to what extent would teacher strategies be more (or less) successful if students had more insight? That this is not easily answered is under-

scored by the underachiever nominees who exhibited the most savvy of the students. Their very status indicates, however, that such knowledge does not necessarily change behavior.

A surprisingly powerful factor to emerge from this study was the association of student responses with teacher socialization style. Recall that behavior modification, particularly as it interacted with grade level, was associated with limited social cognitive skills. Thus, it appears that the socialization of thought is especially potent with those whose cognitive skills are less developed. This influence upon initial perception as well as interpretation of behavior is an unexpectedly powerful effect associated with the socialization style of teachers. This strong teacher socialization style effect is likely due to several factors. Recall that these teachers were selected on two criteria. First was their expertise. All teachers had previously participated in the Classroom Strategy Study, and had been judged by the author as outstanding in their ability to deal effectively and consistently with difficult students. Secondly, the teachers were categorized as representing one of two "types" of socialization styles. The teachers who participated in this study, then, do not represent "the average classroom teacher." The findings of this investigation are best viewed as evidence of the potential that teachers have (or do not have) to influence their students' social cognition through a consistent socialization style. Student interpersonal behavior is a different issue, however, and as has been described elsewhere, benefits in cognition associated with a particular socialization style do not necessarily directly translate into beneficial effects in social behavior (see Rohrkemper, Note 1).

Finally, this study was limited to verbal reports of classroom events, and it is unknown if this influence is evidenced outside of the classroom or if it maintains beyond a given school year. The classroom represents such a tightly contained social system, it may well be that classroom realities have clear boundaries and are separate from other aspects of students' lives. Nonetheless, these data indicate our need to learn more of this potential to influence students' social cognition in fundamental ways.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the present investigation indicate the need to know more about how teachers and students interpret their own and one another's behavior. The data provide valuable information on the difference between intended and actualized behavior and goals and indicate the need to examine the slippage between messages which teachers apparently intend to communicate to their students and that which is actually perceived. The differences among students' responses that were associated with grade level help point to areas that teachers of younger children may want to stress so that students perceive behavior as intended. Differences in students' reports that were associated with teacher socialization style are provocative and underscore the need to learn more about the socialization role of the classroom teacher.

Methodological Issues. The performance of the observers in this investigation indicates the limits of observation in interpreting others' behavioral plans, particularly when these plans involve subgoals within a hierarchical framework. That the differences in teachers' and observers' reports were not merely a function of teacher ego enhancement was indicated by teachers' greater willingness than observers to report punishment and threatening and pressuring

behavior in their responses to students. This data lends support to the multiple method approach to the study of perception. The combination of observation and interview procedures and the use of stimulated recall techniques seem well suited to such investigation.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Rohrkemper, M.M. Classroom Perspectives Study: An investigation of differential perceptions of classroom events. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981.

2. Rohrkemper, M.M. & Brophy, J. The Classroom Strategy Study: Investigating teacher strategies with problem students. (Research Series No. 50.) East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1979.

REFERENCES

Brophy, J. & Rohrkemper, M.M. The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, 73, 295-311.

Gordon, T. Parent Effectiveness Training. New York: Wyden, Inc., 1970.

Gordon, T. Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Wyden, Inc., 1974.

Rohrkemper, M.M. & Brophy, J. Teachers' thinking about problem students. In J. Levine and M. Wang (Eds.), Teacher and student perceptions: Implications for learning. Englewood Cliffs: Erlbaum, 1982.

Table 1.

Means and Standard Deviations for Teacher Self Report, Observer Predictions, Student Predictions, and Student as Teacher Vignette 1 (V1), Vignette 2 (V2), and Vignette 3 (V3). 1,*

	Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
ITEM	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Rewards and Punishments																		
AAA0. More mentioned	0	0	38	52	1.00	0	63	52	75	46	88	35	99	08	99	12	99	12
AAA1. Symbolic	38	52	13	35	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	12	0	0
AAA2. Material	38	52	13	35	0	0	25	46	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAA3. Special privileges	50	54	63	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08
AAA4 Teacher	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAA5. Other	25	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	08
AAA6 Contracts	50	54	50	54	0	0	25	46	25	46	0	0	01	08	0	0	0	0
Punishments																		
AAB0. None	13	35	50	54	88	35	38	52	63	52	1.00	0	16	36	29	45	83	38

Table 1 (cont'd).

	Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
AAB1. Loss of privileges	63	52	25	46	13	35	63	52	38	52	0	0	18	39	11	32	07	26
AAB2 Punitive isolation	0	0	13	35	0	0	13	35	25	46	0	0	37	45	33	47	08	27
AAB3 Extra time	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	04	13	0	0	01	03
AAB4 Extra requirements	13	35	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	06	25	05	22	0	0
AAB5 Restitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	08	0	0
AAB6 Physical punishment	13	35	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	35	18	39	04	20
AAB7 Other adult	38	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	49	38	49	05	22
AAB8 Other Supportive Behavior	25	46	0	0	0	0	25	46	0	0	0	0	20	41	08	27	04	20
AAC0 None	25	46	38	52	0	0	88	35	63	52	0	0	97	17	99	12	21	41

Table 1 (cont'd.)

		Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
AAC1	Specific praise	38	52	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	52	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAC2	Global praise	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	01	08
AAC3	Encouragement	25	46	13	35	25	46	0	0	0	0	88	35	01	08	01	08	24	43
AAC4	Comfort/ reassurance	0	0	0	0	38	52	0	0	13	35	13	35	0	0	0	0	04	20
AAC5	Defending	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAC6	Kid gloves	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAC7	Supportive isolation	0	0	25	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	12	0	0	0	0
AAC8	Involves peers	0	0	13	35	63	52	0	0	0	0	25	46	0	0	0	0	08	27

Table 1 (cont'd.)

	Teacher self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
AAC9 Involves parents	0	0	0	0	25	46	13	35	0	0	0	0	01	08	0	0	03	17
AAC10 Other adults	13	35	38	52	38	52	0	0	0	0	25	46	0	0	01	08	06	24
AAC11 Instruction	50	54	0	0	88	35	13	35	0	0	1.00	0	01	08	0	0	62	49
AAC12 Models acceptance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAC13 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	13	35	0	0	01	08	03	17
Threatening/pressuring behavior																		
AAD0 None	63	52	13	35	1.00	0	13	35	0	0	1.00	0	29	46	15	36	80	40
AAD1 Specific criticism	25	46	88	35	0	0	75	46	88	35	0	0	69	46	84	37	18	39
AAD2 Global criticism	0	0	13	35	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	0	0

Table 1 (cont'd.)

		Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
AAD3	Sarcasm/ ridicule	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	01	08	0	0	01	08
AAD4	"Diagnosing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAD5	Third degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAD6	Involves peers	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAD7	Involves parents	25	46	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	03	17	02	14	01	08
AAD8	Involves other adults	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	01	08	01	08	0	0
AAD9	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	52	0	0	0	0	01	12	01	12	01	08
Teacher General Strategies																			
ABA0	None	13	35	88	35	0	0	88	35	88	35	0	0	99	08	99	08	14	35
ABA1	Help	50	54	0	0	88	35	13	35	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	58	50
ABA2	Reduce task	38	52	0	0	75	46	0	0	0	0	63	52	0	0	0	0	15	36

Table 1 (cont'd.)

		Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
ABA3	Deal with affect	50	54	13	35	75	46	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	01	08	24	43
ABA4	Other	0	0	0	0	25	46	0	0	13	35	60	55	01	03	0	0	16	37
ABB0	None	0	0	0	0	88	35	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	01	08	01	12	73	45
ABB1	No response avoidance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	01	08	0	0	01	08
ABB2	Delegates problem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	03	17	02	14	0	0
ABB3	Extinguish	13	35	25	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	0	0	0	0
ABB4	Postpone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08
ABB5	Management response	38	52	38	52	0	0	50	54	50	54	0	0	30	46	29	45	12	32
ABB6	Tension release	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABB7	Reward	75	46	50	54	0	0	38	52	13	35	0	0	01	08	0	0	0	0
ABB8	Punishment	88	35	38	52	13	35	63	52	38	52	0	0	73	45	60	49	10	30
ABB9	Removal/ Isolation	0	0	13	35	0	0	13	35	38	52	0	0	37	49	31	46	08	28

Table 1 (cont'd.)

	Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
ABB10 Prescribing	25	46	0	0	0	0	25	46	38	52	0	0	01	08	0	0	0	0
ABB11 Proscribing	13	35	50	54	0	0	25	46	50	54	0	0	0	0	10	31	0	0
ABB12 Change physical environment	0	0	25	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	0	0
ABB13 Change social environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABB14 Eliminate source of problem	13	35	50	54	0	0	25	46	50	54	0	0	0	0	09	29	0	0
ABB15 Catharsis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABB16 Insight	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	02	14	02	14	0	0
ABB17 Builds self concept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABB18 Relationship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
* ABB19 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	01	08	01	08	0	0

Table 1 (cont'd.)

		Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
	Information Gathering																		
	ABC0 No	88	35	1.00	0	88	35	1.00	0	1.00	0	88	35	99	08	99	12	89	32
*	ABC1 Yes	13	35	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	13	35	01	08	01	12	10	31
*	ABC2 Can't rate/ other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08
	Student Input re solution																		
	ABD0 No	63	52	88	35	75	46	88	35	1.00	0	1.00	0	1.00	0	99	08	98	14
*	ABD1 Yes	38	52	13	35	25	46	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	12
*	ABD2 Can't rate/ other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Developing Insight																		
	ABE0 None	63	52	38	52	1.00	0	63	52	50	54	1.00	0	97	17	88	33	99	12
	ABE1 Recognize own behavior and consequences	13	35	38	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	12	03	17	0	0

Table 1 (cont'd.)

	Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
ABE2 Causes of own behavior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	12
ABE3 Recognize others' behavior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABE4 Causes of others' behavior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABE5 Student's feelings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABE6 Others' feelings	13	35	50	54	0	0	13	35	38	52	0	0	01	08	08	28	0	0
ABE7 Teacher's goals/feelings	25	46	38	52	0	0	38	52	25	46	0	0	0	0	01	12	0	0
*ABE8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	08	0	0

Table 1 (cont'd.)

	Teacher Self Report						Observers' Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Rationale For Demands																		
ABF0 No demands	25	46	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	05	22	79	41
ABF1 No rationales	13	35	25	46	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	60	49	63	49	16	37
ABF2 Cites rules	50	54	13	35	0	0	50	54	38	52	0	0	38	49	24	43	05	22
ABF3 Personal appeal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABF4 Moralizes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ABF5 Induces empathy	13	35	50	54	0	0	13	35	50	54	0	0	0	0	11	32	0	0
ABF6 Logical analysis	50	54	0	0	0	0	50	54	0	0	0	0	01	08	0	0	0	0
ABF7 Pride/self-concept	50	54	25	46	0	0	13	35	13	35	0	0	01	08	01	12	01	08
*ABF8 Safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*ABF9 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1 (cont'd.)

	Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
*ABF10 Can't rate/ other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	12	0	0	0	0
Universal System Language																		
ACB - Language (higher value = less language)	1.63	52	1.75	71	1.25	46	1.75	71	1.75	71	1.00	0						
*ACB4 no language	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	03	17	04	20	13	33
Goals																		
ACD0 None reported	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ACD1 Mental hygiene	25	46	25	46	88	35	13	35	13	35	1.00	0	01	12	01	08	16	37
ACD2 Rewards/shaping	88	35	63	52	25	46	63	52	63	52	0	0	05	22	14	35	55	50
ACD3 Control/ punish	13	35	38	52	0	0	63	52	63	52	0	0	92	28	90	30	31	46
*ACD4 Avoidance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	12	02	14	04	20

Table 1 (cont'd.)

	Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
	V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
ACD5 Can't rate/ other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	08	02	14
Giving Chances																		
* AD0 Not applicable	13	35	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	01	08	78	42
AD1 Yes	25	46	25	46	0	0	38	52	50	54	0	0	30	46	36	48	07	26
* AD2 No	63	52	75	46	0	0	63	52	50	54	0	0	70	46	68	47	15	36
Reporting Ease																		
* AE0 Not applicable													0	0	0	0	0	0
AE1 Teacher words													16	37	27	45	26	44
* AE2 Teacher actions													11	31	04	20	13	33
AE3 Equally facile													73	44	67	47	59	49
* AE4 Can't rate													0	0	02	14	04	18

Table 1 (cont'd.)

		Teacher Self Report						Observer Predictions						Student Predictions					
		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3		V1		V2		V3	
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
	Non Verbal Behavior																		
*	AF0 Not applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	08	0	0
	AF1 Yes	38	52	63	52	38	52	75	46	63	52	25	46	15	36	17	37	10	30
*	AF2 No	63	52	38	52	63	52	25	46	38	52	75	46	85	36	83	38	91	29
	Primary Domain of Teacher Language																		
*	AG0 Not applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	08	01	08	02	14
	AG1 Academic performance	38	52	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	01	08	79	41
	AG2 Academic procedures	25	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	03	17	0	0	05	22
	AG3 Social procedures	0	0	38	52	0	0	88	35	50	54	0	0	96	20	91	29	17	38
	AG4 Social/moral norms	0	0	38	52	0	0	13	35	38	52	0	0	01	09	13	34	0	0
*	AG5 More than one of the above	38	52	25	46	0	0	0	0	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1 [1,*]

[1]Variable reorganizations in subsequent analyses:

Sum of rewards = ΣAAA1 - AAA6

Sum of punishments = ΣAAB1 - AAB8

Sum of supportive behaviors = ΣAAC1 - AAC13

Sum of threatening/pressuring behaviors = ΣAAD1 - AAD9

Sum of academic strategies = ΣABA1 - ABA4

Sum of avoidance strategies = ΣABB1 - ABB4

Sum of prescribing/proscribing strategies = ΣABB10 + ABB11

Sum of environmental changes = ΣABB12 + ABB13

Sum of psychological approaches = ΣABB14 - ABB18, ABB6

Sum of self-insight strategies = ΣABE1 - ABE2, ABE5

Sum of insight into others strategies = ΣABE3 - ABE4, ABE6

Sum of concern for others strategies = ΣABF3 - ABF5

Sum of concern for self strategies = ΣABF6 - ABF7

Sum of academic language domain = ΣAG1, AG2

Sum of social language domain = ΣAG3, AG4

*Indicates variable was deleted from subsequent analyses

Table 2. Student Predictions of Teacher Response. Summary of Significant Results of Analyses of Variance Due to Grade Level, Teacher Socialization Style, Student Level of Classroom Adjustment, Sex and Interactions.[1,2]

ITEM	Grade Level			Teacher Socialization Style			Level of Classroom Adjustment			Sex			Interactions[3]		
Teacher Behavior	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3
No rewards															
Sum of rewards															
No punishments		*** L<U	*** L<U	* BM<I											
Sum of punishments		*** L>U	*** L>U												
No supportive			*** L>U												* <LBM
Sum of supportive			*** L<U												
No threats/pressures		* L>U						* ** <H,LA							
Sum of threats/pressures								* * >H,LA							
No academic strategies			** L>U												
Sum of academic strategies			* L<U												
No nonacademic strategies															
Avoidance strategies															
Management response				** BM<I									* >LBM	* >LBM	
Reward															
Punishment	* L>U	*** L>U													
Removal/isolation	* L>U	** L>U	*** L>U	*** BM>I											
Pre- or proscribing															
Change of physical or social environment															

Table 2 (continued)

ITEM Teacher Behavior	Grade Level			Teacher Socialization Style			Level of Classroom Adjustment			Sex			Interactions[3]		
	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3
Psychological diagnostic approach															
No information gathering															
No student impact															
No concern for insight	* L>U	** L>U													
Self-insight															
Other insight															
Teacher goals/feelings															
No behavior demands															
No rationale		*** L>U						* <H			* M>F				
Cites rules	*** L<U	*** L<U		** BM<I				* >H,LA							
Concern for others											* M<F				
Concern for self															
Extent of language								* <UA			* M<F				* >LBM
Goal: Mental hygiene															
Goal: Shaping/rewards			** L<U	** BM<I	** BM<I										
Goal: Control/punish			*** L>U								* M>F		* >UI		
Gives changes															
Focus on teacher words		* L<U											* >LBM		
Focus on words & actions													**		

Table 2 (continued)

ITEM Teacher Behavior	Grade Level			Teacher Socialization Style			Level of Classroom Adjustment			Sex			Interactions[3]		
	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3
Nonverbal behavior	* L<U	* L<U													
Language domain: academic			** L<U												
Language domain: social															
Language domain: both															

[1] * = p <.05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001

[2] KEY: Grade level: Upper, Lower

Teacher Socialization Style: Behavior Modification Inductions

Level of Classroom Adjustment: Hperactive, Low Achiever, Under Achiever

Sex: Male, Female

[3] Most unique cell described in terms of its relation to others

Table 3 Frequencies, means and standard deviations for Student Understanding of Teacher Behavior, Vignette 1, Vignette 2, and Vignette 3. Overall sample.

Item	Vignette 1			Vignette 2			Vignette 3		
	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	f	$\bar{X}$	SD
Memory Checks									
II/a/a/0. None	139	.98	.14	136	.94	.23	124	.86	.35
*II/a/a/1. Once	2	.01	.12	7	.05	.22	19	.13	.34
*II/a/a/2. Twice	1	.01	.08	1	.01	.08	0	.00	.00
*II/a/a/3. Three or more	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	1	.01	.08
Memory Prompts									
*II/a/b/0. None	142	.99	.12	141	.98	.14	141	.98	.14
*II/a/b/1. Once	2	.01	.12	3	.02	.14	3	.02	.14
*II/a/b/2. Twice	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00
*II/a/b/3. Three or more	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00
Distortion									
*II/a/c/0. None	144	1.00	.00	139	.97	.18	131	.91	.29
II/a/c/2. Intentionality	0	.00	.00	3	.02	.14	13	.09	.29
*II/a/c/3. Other/can't rate	0	.00	.00	2	.01	.12	0	.00	.00
Perceived Cause of Teacher Response									
*IIAH0. Can't rate	4	.03	.17	5	.04	.18	9	.06	.25
IIAH1. Teacher personality	18	.13	.33	14	.10	.30	9	.06	.25
IIAH2. Teacher role	47	.33	.47	52	.36	.48	57	.40	.49
IIAH3. Student personality	2	.01	.12	4	.03	.17	9	.06	.25
IIAH4. Student role	86	.60	.49	80	.56	.50	63	.45	.50
Affective Quality									
IIAI0. None	85	.59	.49	82	.57	.50	58	.41	.49
IIAI1. Positive	30	.21	.41	45	.32	.47	73	.52	.50
IIAI2. Negative	23	.16	.37	11	.08	.27	2	.01	.12
*IIAI3. Can't rate	5	.04	.18	5	.04	.18	8	.06	.23

Table 3 (cont'd.)

	Vignette 1			Vignette 2			Vignette 3		
	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	f	$\bar{X}$	SD
Nature of Teacher Goal									
*IIAJ0. Not applicable	3	.02	.14	3	.02	.14	1	.01	.08
IIAJ1. Prescriptive	118	.83	.38	96	.67	.47	136	.96	.20
IIAJ2. Proscriptive	7	.05	.22	14	.10	.30	3	.02	.14
IIAJ3. Both	15	.11	.31	30	.21	.41	2	.01	.12
Target of Teacher Influence									
*IIAK0. Not applicable	3	.02	.14	3	.02	.14	2	.01	.12
IIAK1. Student behavior	134	.94	.24	137	.96	.20	103	.73	.45
IIAK2. Student attitude	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	13	.09	.29
IIAK3. Both	6	.04	.20	3	.02	.14	24	.17	.38
Range of Teacher Expectations									
*IIAL0. Not applicable	3	.02	.14	3	.02	.14	1	.01	.08
IIAL1. Immediate	131	.92	.28	137	.96	.20	137	.97	.19
*IIAL2. Long term	9	.06	.24	3	.02	.14	4	.03	.17
Primary Focus									
*IIAM0. Not applicable	3	.02	.14	3	.02	.14	1	.01	.08
IIAM1. Instructional	13	.09	.29	6	.04	.20	107	.75	.43
IIAM2. Managerial	35	.25	.43	61	.43	.50	10	.07	.26
IIAM3. Both	92	.64	.48	73	.51	.50	24	.17	.38
Student Inference									
IIAN0. None	10	.07	.26	10	.07	.26	5	.04	.18
*IIAN1. Teacher affect	3	.02	.14	2	.01	.12	0	.00	.00
IIAN2. Level 1 cognition	98	.68	.47	108	.75	.44	119	.83	.38
IIAN3. Level 2 cognition	25	.17	.38	19	.13	.34	14	.10	.30
*IIAN4. Can't rate	8	.06	.23	5	.04	.18	5	.04	.18
Type of Teacher Evaluation									
*IIAO0. None	5	.04	.18	8	.06	.23	4	.03	.17
IIAO1. Student per se	76	.53	.50	95	.66	.48	73	.51	.50

Table 3 (cont'd.)

	Vignette 1			Vignette 2			Vignette 3		
	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	f	$\bar{X}$	SD
IIA02. Performance	25	.17	.38	13	.09	.29	42	.29	.46
IIA03. Ability	5	.04	.18	3	.02	.14	52	.36	.48
IIA04. Conformity	41	.29	.45	34	.24	.43	5	.04	.18
IIA05. Affect	16	.11	.32	7	.05	.22	5	.04	.18
*IIA06. Other	9	.06	.24	5	.04	.18	4	.03	.17
Nature of Judgment									
*IIAP0. Can't rate	14	.10	.30	13	.09	.29	8	.06	.23
IIAP1. Positive	9	.06	.24	6	.04	.20	58	.41	.49
IIAP2. Negative	83	.58	.50	83	.58	.50	28	.20	.40
IIAP3. Neutral	14	.10	.30	21	.15	.35	39	.27	.45
IIAP4. Mixed	25	.17	.38	21	.15	.35	10	.07	.26
Concern for Others									
*IIAQ0. No	128	.89	.32	98	.68	.47	140	.98	.14
IIAQ1. Yes	16	.11	.32	46	.32	.47	3	.02	.14

*Indicates this variable was not included in subsequent analyses.

Table 4. Student Understanding of Teacher Behavior. Summary of Significant Results of Analyses of Variance Due to Grade Level, Teacher Socialization Style, Student Level of Classroom Adjustment, Sex and Interactions.[1,2]

ITEM	Grade Level			Teacher Socialization Style			Level of Classroom Adjustment			Sex			Interactions[3]		
	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3
Cause of T response															
Tchr. personality														**	
Tcnr. role	** L<U	*** L<U			* BM<I	** BM<I						* M<F			
St. personality		** L>U						** >H				* M>F		* >LHBM	
St. Role															
No affect as motive	** L>U	** L>U	*** L>U						** >SH			* M<F			
Positive affect as motive	** L<U	*** L<U	*** L<U	* BM<I	* BM<I	* BM<I					* M<F				
Negative affect as motive							* >H								
Teacher Goal															
Prescriptive			* L<U												
Proscriptive									* >UA						
Both															
Target of Change															
St. behavior												* M>F			
St. attitude												* M<F			
Immediate change															
Focus: Instruction		* L<U	*** L<U			* BM<I								* <UI	* >LBM
Focus: Management		* L>U	** L>U		* BM>I	* BM>I	* >H								
Focus: Both		* L<U	** L>U		* BM<I						* M>F	* M>F			

Table 4 (continued)

ITEM	Grade Level			Teacher Socialization Style			Level of Classroom Adjustment			Sex			Interactions[3]		
	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3	V1	V2	V3
St. Inference															
Level 1 cognition	** L>U	** L>U													
Level 2 cognition	*** L<U	** L<U													
Tchr. Evaluation															
Student per se	** L>U	** L>U	*** L>U												
St. performance	* L<U	* L<U	** L<U	** BM<I		* BM<I							* <UI		
St. ability	* L<U	*	*** L<U												
St. conformity	** L<U	** L<U													
St. affect	** L<U														
Nature of Judgment															
Positive															* <LI
														** <LBM	
Negative	** L>U	*** L>U	** L>U										* <LBM	* <LH,LSH	
Neutral		** L<U	*** L<U											* <UBM	
Mixed	* L<U												<UBM		
Concern for Others	* L<U	*** L<U											** <UBM	* >LBM	

[1] * = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001

[2] Key: Grade Level: Upper, Lower
Teacher Socialization Style: Behavior Modification, Induction
Level of Classroom Adjustment: Hyperactive, Shared problem nominees, UnderAchiever
Sex: Male, Female

[3] Most unique cell described in terms of its relation to others